



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/815,478	03/31/2004	James Loran Ball	ALTRP134/A1466	6370	
51501	7590	09/03/2009 WEAVER AUSTIN VILLENEUVE & SAMPSON LLP - ALTERA ATTN: ALTERA P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			
				EXAMINER GEIB, BENJAMIN P	
		ART UNIT 2181		PAPER NUMBER	
			MAIL DATE 09/03/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/815,478	BALL, JAMES LORAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BENJAMIN P. GEIB	2181	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8, 14-19, 31 and 32 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 14-19, 31 and 32 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Art Unit: 2181

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/26/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Applicant, via amendment, has overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection set forth in the previous Office Action regarding claim 32. Consequently, the examiner has withdrawn this rejection. However, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection set forth in the previous Office Action regarding claim 31 still applies.
3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Claim 31 recites a limitation referring to "the array." However, there is no previous mention within the claims of an "array," and, therefore, the limitations render the claims indefinite. Because it appears that applicant intended the "array" to recite "processor," the examiner will interpret the claim as such for the remainder of the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2181

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-8 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Killian et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,420,992), hereinafter Killian.

8. Regarding claim 1, Killian teaches a processor, comprising:

a plurality of registers [*register file; 42; FIG. 2A*];

circuitry [*execution unit 15; FIG. 2A*] configured to process a plurality of instructions associated with an instruction set including a plurality of branch and non-branch instructions [*column 7, lines 57-66*], the plurality of instructions each having a multi-byte length [*all instructions are 32-bit words; column 7, lines 57-66*], the plurality of instructions accessible at multi-byte aligned addresses [*Because the instructions are 32-bit words (i.e. multi-byte), the instructions are accessed at multi-byte aligned addresses*];

common subcircuitry [*sign-extension circuit 78; FIG. 3C*] operable to perform sign extensions of an immediate field in non-branch instructions and to perform sign extensions of said immediate fields in branch instructions to calculate a target address for branch instructions, wherein said common subcircuitry operating on said non-branch instructions is the same subcircuitry operating upon said branch instructions [*column 8, lines 7-13, FIG. 3C*].

wherein substantially all multi-byte aligned branch instructions are operable to access all instructions at byte aligned addresses [*Because the sign-extended immediate of a branch instruction is added directly to the program counter (column 11, lines 62-64; FIG. 3C), the branch instructions have access to all instructions at byte aligned addresses*].

9. Regarding claim 2, Killian has taught the processor of claim 1, wherein the plurality of instructions are accessed at word aligned addresses [*Because the instructions are 32-bit words (column 5, lines 20-27; column 7, lines 57-66), the instructions are accessed at word aligned addresses*].

10. Regarding claim 3, Killian has taught a processor of claim 1, wherein the plurality of instructions are accessed at half-word aligned addresses [*Because the instructions are 32-bit*

Art Unit: 2181

words (column 5, lines 20-27; column 7, lines 57-66), the instructions are accessed at half-word aligned addresses].

11. Regarding claim 4, Killian has taught the processor of claim 1, wherein accessing the instructions comprises reading and writing the addresses [*column 11, lines 62-64*].

12. Regarding claim 5, Killian has taught the processor of claim 1, wherein branch instructions comprise branch and conditional branch instructions [*instructions include jump (i.e. branch) and branch (i.e. conditional branch) instructions; column 7, lines 57-66*].

13. Regarding claim 6, Killian has taught the processor of claim 1, wherein branch instructions comprise a branch offset and a current program counter value [*column 11, lines 62-64*].

14. Regarding claim 7, Killian has taught the processor of claim 1, wherein the units of branch offset and a current program counter are in bytes [*column 11, lines 62-64*].

15. Regarding claim 8, Killian has taught the processor of claim 1, wherein the plurality of instructions are one word in length [*all instructions are 32-bit words; column 5, lines 20-27; column 7, lines 57-66*].

16. Referring to claim 31, Killian has taught the processor of claim 1, wherein one of a primary or secondary component accesses memory of the processor directly through ports without access through a system bus, and wherein the array does not comprise a system bus [*FIG. 1*].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2181

18. Claims 14-19 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Killian in view of Wittig et al., "OneChip: An FPGA Processor with Reconfigurable Logic" (hereinafter Wittig).

19. Regarding claim 14, Killian teaches a processor, comprising:

a plurality of registers [*register file; 42; FIG. 2A*];
circuitry [*execution unit 15; FIG. 2A*] configured to process a plurality of branch and non-branch instructions associated with an instruction set [*instructions include jump (i.e. branch), immediate, and register (i.e. non-branch) instructions; column 7, lines 57-66*], the plurality of branch instructions and non-branch instructions including an immediate field [*column 8, lines 7-13*];

wherein common subcircuitry [*sign-extension circuit 78; FIG. 3C*] that performs a sign extension of an immediate field associated with one or more branch instructions and that performs a sign extension of said immediate field associated with one or more non-branch instructions, wherein said common subcircuitry operating on said non-branch instructions is the same subcircuitry operating upon said branch instructions, wherein the sign extension of the immediate field associated with one or more branch instructions is performed to determine a branch target address [*column 8, lines 7-13; FIG. 3C*]; and wherein each of the plurality of branch instructions and non-branch instructions has a multi-byte length and is operable to access all instructions at byte aligned addresses [*Because the sign-extended immediate of a branch instruction is added directly to the program counter (column 11, lines 62-64; FIG. 3C), the branch instructions have access to all instructions at byte aligned addresses*].

Killian has not taught that the processor is in a field programmable gate array.

Wittig has taught incorporating a processor within a field programmable gate array [See *Wittig, Introduction*].

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the processor of Killian within a field programmable gate array.

Art Unit: 2181

The motivation for doing so would be to allow closely coupled access to programmable logic, thereby improving performance of applications requiring the programmable logic [See *Wittig, Introduction*].

20. Regarding claim 15, Killian and Wittig have taught the field programmable gate array of claim 14, wherein the instruction set comprises a plurality of instructions [*column 7, lines 57-66*].

21. Regarding claim 16, Killian and Wittig have taught the field programmable gate array of claim 15, wherein the plurality of instructions are accessed at half-word aligned addresses [*Because the instructions are 32-bit words (column 5, lines 20-27; column 7, lines 57-66), the instructions are accessed at half-word aligned addresses*].

22. Regarding claim 17, Killian and Wittig have taught the field programmable gate array of claim 14, wherein branch instructions comprise branch and conditional branch instructions [*instructions include jump (i.e. branch) and branch (i.e. conditional branch) instructions; column 7, lines 57-66*].

23. Regarding claim 18, Killian and Wittig have taught the field programmable gate array of claim 14, wherein common subcircuitry [*sign-extension circuit 78; FIG. 3C*] is used to handle the immediate field associated with the branch and non-branch instructions and wherein an immediate field value is maintained in units of bytes [*Because the sign-extended immediates of branch and non-branch instructions are added directly to the 32-bit program counter and base address, respectively, (column 11, lines 40-64; FIG. 3C), the branch and non-branch immediates are maintained in units of bytes*].

24. Regarding claim 19, Killian and Wittig have taught the field programmable gate array of claim 18, wherein common subcircuitry is used to perform sign-extensions of the immediate field associated with the branch and non-branch instructions [*sign-extension circuit 78; FIG. 3C; column 11, lines 40-64*].

25. Referring to claim 32, Killian and Wittig have taught the field programmable gate array of claim 14, wherein one of a primary or secondary component accesses memory of the field programmable gate array directly through ports without access through a system bus, and wherein the array does not comprise a system bus [*FIG. 1*].

Response to Arguments

26. Applicant's arguments filed 05/26/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
27. The applicant argues the novelty/rejection of the claims, in substance that:
 - a) "Intel does not disclose or suggest 'wherein substantially all multi-byte aligned branch instructions are operable to access all instructions at byte aligned addresses.'" (page 5)
 - b) "Killian does not disclose 'access all instructions at byte aligned addresses.'" (page 6)
28. These arguments are not found persuasive for the following reasons:
29. Regarding point a, the argument has been considered but is moot in view of the new ground of rejection.
30. Regarding point b, Killian has taught adding the sign-extended immediate of a branch instruction directly to the 32-bit program counter. See column 11, lines 62-64; FIG. 3C. Because of this, all addresses capable of being accessed by the program counter within the range of the immediate are accessible. Therefore, because the program counter accesses byte aligned addresses, the branch instructions are operable to access all instructions at byte aligned addresses.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN P. GEIB whose telephone number is (571)272-8628. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alford Kindred can be reached on (571) 272-4037. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2181

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Benjamin P Geib
Examiner
Art Unit 2181

/Benjamin P Geib/
Examiner, Art Unit 2181

/CHUN-KUAN LEE/
Examiner, Art Unit 2181